RESOLUTION OF THE TRANSPORTATION PERMIT EFFICIENCY AND
ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE (TPEAC)
December 12, 2001

FOR THE PURPOSE OF DEVELOPING A PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM	TPEAC RESOLUTION NUMBER ___6___

Engrossed Senate Bill 6188 of 2001 formed the Transportation Permit
Efficiency and Accountability Committee. It is the intent of this
resolution to put in place a structure for measuring the performance of
TPEAC and technical subcommittee actions. Changes and adjustments
are likely to occur to the proposed structure; however, it is proposed
that TPEAC agree on a general path forward for developing the
"system" and mechanism for tracking and reporting progress.

RESOLUTION FOR APPROVAL BY TPEAC:

The performance measurement structure proposal is attached
and includes the following elements:

1. Description
2. Drivers
3. Scope
4. Existing information to leverage
5. Basic structure
6. Next steps

ADOPTED by the TPEAC (January 9, 2002).

_____
Senator Dan Swecker, Committee Chairman

Result of Vote for Resolution #6

Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Senator Swecker	X			
Senator Prentice				
Representative Ericksen	X			
Representative Rockefeller				
Department of Transportation	X			
Department of Ecology	X			
Department of Fish & Wildlife	X			
Association of Washington Cities				
Washington State Association of Counties	x			

ADOPTED by the TPEAC (January 9, 2002).

_____
Senator Dan Swecker, Committee Chairman

Permit Streamlining Monitoring and Performance Measurement Structure

Description

Permit streamlining stretch goals have been established to communicate the intent of the Act and to drive the measurement of progress towards improving the performance of permitting. This paper provides an approach to develop the performance measurement structure and process.

Drivers
- Doug MacDonald's interest in accountability and success of the project
- TPEAC members' need to be accountable
- Legislators for a return on the investment
- Interested parties, environmental groups, public
- WSDOT contractor's need for consistency and certainty

Scope
- Determine qualitative and quantitative metrics by subcommittee aligned with the various goals
- Determine overall metrics and return on investment reporting mechanism for the project
- Identify the tools that will be used to track and measure performance
- Work with field staff to "test" tools for measuring and tracking performance
- Identify and assign individual responsibility for monitoring measurement of progress

Existing Information to Leverage
- TPEAC member critical success factors
- Ad hoc regional tracking information
- Current performance measures and methodologies and lessons learned

Basic Structure
- See following page

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT STRUCTURE

	25% reduction in mitigation costs	50% increase in environmental benefit	60% of projects in programmatics	50% reduction in redesign	50% reduction in permit timing
Goal					
~~Definition~~ **Objective**	Reduce cost of mitigation site development through the use of watershed-based mitigation where practicable.	~~Where practicable, Provide greater~~ benefit to the environment through the use of watershed-based data and ~~Approaches~~ **methodologies**	Identify projects and activities that lend themselves to Programmatic **or gen permits.** agreements, then prioritize and develop agreements	Identify factors causing projects to require redesign and develop action strategies to prevent those factors from occurring.	Reduce the time it takes to get from the ROD to permit issuance by 50% of original schedule
~~Primary Indicator~~ **Performance Measure**	Dollars	~~# projects w/benefits~~ # acres, habitat, conserved or restored ~~# of credits~~ Cumulative benefits in watersheds **relative to onsite mitigatn**	# of projects **# agreements and general permits**	# of projects	Schedule
Baseline	Average annual cost for mitigation	Current env. Impacts or benefit ~~that exists today~~ **from project mitigation**	# of projects that utilize a similar process (i.e., JARPA)	# of projects _AND/OR_ current cost of redesign	Existing project schedules for projects adopting streamlining measures
Subcommittees	One-Stop Permitting	Watershed Mitigation	Programmatics	Pilot Projects	Training, Compliance, and Reporting
Related Goals	#4 #5	#1 #2 #4 #5	#3 #4 #5	#1-5	#1,2,4,5 Compliance & Reporting #1-5 for Training

Subcommittee Related Goals

Subcommittee	Goal 1	2	3	4	5
One-stop Permitting	○	○	◑	◑	●
Watershed Mitigation	●	●	○	●	◑
Programmatic Permitting	◑	◑	●	◑	●
Pilot Projects	●	●	●	●	●
Compliance, Training, and Reporting	○	◑	◑	○	◑

● *Strong influence*
◑ *Some influence*
○ *Low/no influence*